

Appl. No.: 09/708,898
Amdt. dated May 25, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of 5-3-2005

II. Remarks In Response to the Office Action

A. General Remarks

Claims 1-24 and 49-64 are pending in the application.

B. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-12, 24, 49-57, and 59-64 are allowed.

C. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 13-14 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,473,363 to Ng et al. ("Ng").

Applicants respectfully traverse the contention that Ng anticipates claims 13-14 and 23 in so far as Ng does not disclose all the limitations in independent claim 13, as amended.

Amended claim 13 recites:

a virtual multipoint control unit communicatively interconnected to the plurality of multipoint control units and controlling participant slots of the multipoint control units, wherein the virtual multipoint control unit is configured to interconnect the plurality of multimedia terminals in the multimedia communication via the participant slots of at least two of the plurality of multipoint control units.

Ng fails to disclose a virtual multipoint control unit that controls participant slots of multipoint control units to interconnect multimedia terminals in a multimedia communication via the participant slots of at least two multipoint control units. Rather, Ng discloses "a system wherein multipoint control units are networked using a predetermined number of mixing operations..." and the multipoint control units "...are cascaded together via a communications link (130), thus allowing the first group of terminals to communication with the second group." Ng at col. 2:17-18 & col. 2:29-32.

Thus, Ng appears to disclose a network of multipoint control units that are cascaded together in such a way to reduce delay using predetermined mixing operations. Because the multipoint control units in Ng appear to be cascaded together in a predetermined manner, Ng

Appl. No.: 09/708,898
Amdt. dated May 25, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of 5-3-2005

fails to disclose a virtual multipoint control unit that is communicatively interconnected to multipoint control units and that controls the participant slots of the multipoint control units so as to interconnect the multimedia terminals in a multimedia communication via the participant slots of at least two of the multipoint control units. For at least these reasons, Applicants believe independent claim 13 and those claims depending therefrom are not anticipated by Ng and respectfully request the Examiner to indicate allowance of these claims in the next paper from the Office.

D. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 15-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,473,363 to Ng et al. ("Ng") in view of US 6,006,253 to Kumar et al. ("Kumar").

Applicants respectfully traverse the contention that the combination of Ng in view of Kumar anticipates claims 15-22 in so far as Ng and Kumar, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations in independent claim 13, as amended, from which claims 15-22 depend. As noted previously, Ng fails to disclose a virtual multipoint control unit that is communicatively interconnected to multipoint control units and that controls the participant slots of the multipoint control units so as to interconnect the multimedia terminals in a multimedia communication via the participant slots of at least two of the multipoint control units.

Kumar fails to provide the limitations missing from Ng because Kumar fails to disclose a virtual multipoint control unit controlling participant slots of a plurality of multipoint control units and configured to interconnect multimedia terminals in a multimedia communication via at least two multipoint control units. Instead, Kumar discloses a single MCU (124 in Fig. 1; 220 in Fig. 2A; and 220 in Fig. 2B) capable of connecting to a plurality of terminals.

Therefore, even if it were appropriate to combine Ng in view of Kumar, which Applicant does not concede, the combination of these references does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicant's independent claims 13. For at least these reasons, Applicants believe that claims 15-22 are in proper form for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner indicate the allowance of these claims in the next paper from the Office.

Appl. No.: 09/708,898
Amdt. dated May 25, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of 5-3-2005

E. Conclusion

This Response is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. 1.114, in which the Commissioner is authorized to charge the fees for the Request. Should any fees be due for any reason, the undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fees that may be required to Wong Cabello's Deposit Account No. 501922, referencing order no. 119-0071US.

To facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 25, 2005

Sean McDermott
Sean McDermott
Reg. No. 49,000

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch, Rutherford
& Brucculeri, LLP
20333 SH 249
Houston, Texas 77070
(832) 446-2416
Fax: 832 446-2424

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office Facsimile No.

703-872-9306 on Date: May 25, 2005

Rebecca G. Lind
Signature

Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate